

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of the Claims**

- Claims 1-12 are pending in the Application.
- Claims 1-12 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claim 1 is amended by Applicant.

### **Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,505,255 to Akatsu et al. (Akatsu) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/010879 to Bouret et al. (Bouret). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to remove a redundant word.

Akatsu discusses a home gateway 504 bridging an internal network and an external network. The home gateway 504 allows communication between the home network and the external network. (See Akatsu, Figure 5). However, Akatsu does not explicitly disclose that the home gateway is able to receive requests for data of the external network from at least one device not capable of independently requesting data of the external network as recited in pending Claim 1. Also, Akatsu does not discuss that a module is able to search for the requested data from at least one data provider in the external network, as recited in pending Claim 1.

Bouret discusses a data communication system having at least one external service provider and an interface entity for receiving information regarding offers of service by the external service provider. The interface entity is arranged to process the offer information from the service providers and to accept some of the offers and register some of those services. The interface entity of Bouret registers services advertised from providers, and then the client is allowed to choose among registered services. The interface entity of Bouret

processes a request by a client to search for a previously registered and accepted service that matches the request. If a matching service is located, the interface entity then requests the service from an external service provider. (See Bouret, paragraphs 0020, 0038, 0049)

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the interface entity of Bouret acts to receive and register offers of service from the offering service providers. The interface entity filters information requests from internal clients. The client choice is restricted to the offers that are accepted and registered by the interface entity. This action is different from the action recited in pending Claim 1 which recites "the module being able to search for the requested data from at least one data provider in the external network". Whereas in Bouret, a service provider offers a service and the interface entity decides whether to accept the service and register it, and a client search is conducted within the interface entity, in the pending claims, a search is initiated by a client device and the service providers are searched more directly.

Whereas Bouret uses the interface entity to internally perform a match of client requests with previously registered services offered by external service providers, pending Claim 1 recites a module that is able to search for the requested data from at least one data provider in the external network. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Akatsu and Bouret fails to discuss the Claim 1 aspect that "the module being able to search for the requested data from at least one data provider in the external network".

Also, in Bouret, a request for service from a client is matched with a list of registered services, and if there is a match, then the request may take the form of a Session Interface Protocol (SIP) message sent by the interface entity to the service provider. (See Bouret, paragraph 0051). However, it is unclear what the service provider sends back to the interface entity as a result of receiving a SIP message. In independent Claim 1, in response to a request for information from a client, the module requests data from one or more providers without the matching step that is performed by Bouret. Then, in Claim 1, the

module receives at least one of data and metadata describing the content of the data available at the at least one data provider in the external network. Claim 1 then recites that the data and metadata are made available to the at least one device in the format according to the one or more protocols defined for the home network. Thus, it is unclear if the service providers of Bouret deliver "at least one of data and metadata describing the content of the data available at the at least one data provider in the external network" as recited in Claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Bouret fails to explicitly discuss the Claim 1 aspect of "the module being further able to receive at least one of data and metadata describing the content of the data available at the at least one data provider in the external network".

Since the combination of Akatsu and Bouret fails to teach or suggest all aspects of independent Claim 1, then the combination of Akatsu and Bouret cannot render obvious pending Claim 1 under 35 USC §103(a) as well as their dependent Claims 2-12 per MPEP §2143.03. Thus, all pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections on Claims 1-12 in light of the arguments presented above.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims patentably define over the cited art and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections of the pending claims. In addition, since the pending claims patentably define over the cited art, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,

Ralf Kohler

Date: February 11, 2009

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

---

Jerome G. Schaefer  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 50,800  
(609) 734-6451

Thomson Licensing, LLC  
Patent Operation  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312